

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
6-1-2012	07-CV-0092	(W.D. Mo.)	<p>Holling-Fry v. Coventry Health Care of Kansas, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Coventry improperly imposed upon individuals enrolled in a Coventry Missouri Health Maintenance Organization ("HMO") plan co-payment amounts which violated a Missouri regulation and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons enrolled in one of Coventry's Missouri HMO plans between 5-30-1998 and 10-31-2010 and who were required to make a special co-payment when the cost of a prescription exceeded 50% of Coventry's formulary acquisition cost for the prescribed drug.</p>	10-10-2012	<p>For more information visit: www.CoventryKansasSettlement.com</p>
6-1-2012	10-CV-05345	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Aguilar, et al. v. Citizens Automobile Finance, Inc. and RBS Citizens, N.A. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated certain sections of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Rule 10b-5 thereunder, and the Securities Act of 1933 from 10-31-2007 through 11-7-2008 (the "Settlement Class Period").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who purchased shares of the publicly-traded common stock of American Capital, LTD. (the "Shares") between 10-31-2007 and 11-7-2008 inclusive.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, email or call: Jeffrey S. Nobel 29 South Main Street Suite 215 West Hartford, CT 06107 jnobel@izardnobel.com (860) 493-6292</p>
6-1-2012	09-CV-03156	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Estrella v. Freedom Financial Network, LLC, et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants charged fees in</p>	9-28-2012	<p>For more information write to: Jennifer Bretan</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>excess of those permitted under the State of California's Prorater Law, imposed early termination penalties, and failed to obtain a license from the State of California. Plaintiffs also allege that the Defendants violated the Credit Repair Organizations Act as well as California's Unfair Competition Law, which prohibits false and misleading advertising.</p> <p>Class Members include anyone who paid Freedom Financial for debt reduction services at any time after 12-28-2004 through the date that the Proposed Settlement is approved by the Court, and did not receive a full refund, and who had bank accounts set up in connection with the Freedom Defendants' debt reduction program, either at Rocky Mountain Bank and Trust or another bank, that were administered by Global Clients Solutions, LLC.</p>		<p>Fenwick & West LLP 555 California Street 12th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104</p>
6-1-2012	09-CV-2081	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>In re: Blood Reagents Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that, as a result of the alleged conduct of the Defendants, prices were inflated for traditional blood reagents.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals or entities in the United States that purchased traditional blood reagents between 1-1-2000 and 2-23-2012 (the "Settlement Class Period") directly from either of the following companies: Immucor, Inc. or Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc. (collectively, the "Defendants").</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit, call or write to:</p> <p>www.ImmucorSettlement.com</p> <p>1-855-231-9423</p> <p>Blood Reagents Antitrust Administrator c/o Kurtzman Carson Consultants LLC P.O. Box 43058 Providence, RI 02940-3058</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
6-1-2012	07-CV-2174	(S.D. Cal.)	<p>Shames, et al. v. The Hertz Corporation, et al. Plaintiffs allege that the Rental Car Defendants, Alamo, Avis, Budget, Dollar, Enterprise, Fox Rent A Car, Hertz, National and Thrifty, conspired to inflate rental prices by assessing two fees: a Tourism Commission Assessment fee (effective 1-1-2007) and the pre-existing Airport Concession Fee.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who rented a vehicle directly from corporate-owned locations of Alamo, Avis, Budget, Dollar, Enterprise, Fox Rent A Car, Hertz, National or Thrifty for pick up at a California airport location from 1-1-2007 - 11-14-2007, and were charged and paid to the rental car company an ACF and/or TCA as a separate line item on their invoice. Rentals from non-corporate owned airport locations, rentals made as part of a pre-existing agreement with a business or governmental body according to which the rental charge was determined, and rentals where a package price was paid to a tour operator or online booking agency (like Priceline or Hotwire) are <u>not</u> included and are <u>not</u> entitled to cash payments or vouchers.</p>	Not set yet	No information
6-1-2012	08-CV-1974	(D.N.J.)	<p>In re Merck & Co., Inc. Vytorin ERISA Litigation The Amended Complaint alleges that Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the Plans' participants and beneficiaries, in violation of §§ 404 and 405 of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 1104 and 1105, by imprudently permitting the Plans to purchase and hold shares in the Merck Common</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call or visit: 1-800-547-4406 www.MerckVytorinERISASettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Stock Fund when Defendants knew or should have known that the Merck Common Stock Fund was an imprudent investment of the Plan's assets.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who were participants in and/or beneficiaries of the Merck & Co., Inc. Employees Savings & Security Plan, the Merck & Co., Inc. Employee Stock Purchase & Savings Plan, or the Merck Puerto Rico Employee Savings & Security Plan (the "Plan") from 7-26-2004 through 3-31-2008, inclusive (the "Class Period"), and whose accounts included investments in the Merck Common Stock Fund (the "Settlement Class").</p>		
6-4-2012	11-CV-00379	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: Netflix Privacy Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Netflix unlawfully retained and disclosed information, including records of the movies and TV shows its subscribers viewed, in violation of the Video Privacy Protection Act and other laws.</p> <p>Class Members are all who live in the U.S. or its territories and are a current or former Netflix subscriber as of [date of entry of preliminary approval].</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Jay Edelson Rafey S. Balabanian Ari J. Scharg Chandler R. Givens Edelson McGuire LLC 350 N. LaSalle Suite 1300 Chicago, IL 60654</p>
6-7-2012	08-CV-2516	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: Municipal Derivatives Antitrust Litigation Notice from J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., J.P. Morgan Securities, Inc., and Bear Stearns & Co, Inc., (collectively, the "Settling Defendants) regarding proposed settlement. Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants violated</p>	12-14-2012	<p>For more information visit or call:</p> <p>www.MunicipalDerivativesSettlement.com</p> <p>1-877-310-0512</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>federal antitrust laws by conspiring to fix, maintain or stabilize the price of municipal derivative transactions and by rigging bids and allocating customers and markets for municipal derivative transactions in the United States.</p> <p>Class Members are all state, local and municipal government entities, independent government agencies, quasi-government, non-profit and private entities that purchased municipal derivative transactions through negotiation, competitive bidding, or auction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directly from any Provider Defendant or Co-Conspirator or brokered by any Broker Defendant or Co-Conspirator at any time from 1-1-1992 through 8-18-2011; and • In the United States and its territories or for delivery in the United States and its territories. 		
6-8-2012	08-CV-985	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Gladys Searcy et al. v. eFunds Corporation et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' consumer disclosure report, called the "SCAN Consumer File Disclosure Reports," willfully violated the provisions of the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA") by failing to provide Plaintiffs and putative Class Members with the information required under the FCRA.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who received one or more Disclosures from SCAN between 6-18-2005 and 7-20-2008.</p>	9-25-2012	<p>For more information write to or call:</p> <p>James Parks Rust Consulting, Inc. 625 Marquette Avenue Suite 880 Minneapolis, MN 55402</p> <p>(612) 359-2000</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
6-11-2012	10-CV-1373	(S.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: AmeriCredit Financial Services, Inc. Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Notice of Intent (NOIs) sent by AmeriCredit between 3-25-2005 and 5-31-2009 regarding repossessed vehicles were legally defective under California's Rees-Levering Automobile Sales Finance Act, and that AmeriCredit is not entitled to collect the deficiency if a deficiency balance remained after a subsequent sale of the vehicle. Plaintiffs have brought claims against AmeriCredit for violation of various California statutes, including Business & Professions Code § 17200, and for declaratory relief.</p> <p>Class Members include anyone who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • purchased a vehicle in California and entered into a conditional sale contract, and • had a sales contract assigned to AmeriCredit, and • had a vehicle repossessed or voluntarily surrendered, and • received an NOI sent by AmeriCredit between 3-25-2005 and 5-31-2009, and • did not redeem the vehicle or reinstate the contract, and • the vehicle was sold for less than the balance due, resulting in a deficiency. 	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or visit:</p> <p>Plaintiffs' Counsel: John W. Hanson The Hanson Law Firm 16870 W. Bernardo Dr., #400 San Diego, CA 92127</p> <p>Tel 858.451.0291</p> <p>john@thesandiegolemonlawyer.com</p> <p>www.thesandiegolemonlawyer.com</p>
6-14-2012	07-CV-04426	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>Alexander, et al. v. Washington Mutual, Inc., et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that portions of the mortgage</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Edward W. Ciolko</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>insurance premiums were used to pay kickbacks for referring private mortgage insurance business. The Action asserts that Defendants' conduct violated Section 8 of the Federal Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974, 12 U.S.C. §§ 2601 et seq.</p> <p>Class Members are all borrowers with Residential Mortgage Loans closed on or after 12-22-2005 through 9-25-2008 that were originated by Washington Mutual Bank or Washington Mutual Bank FSB and reinsured by WM Mortgage Reinsurance Company, Inc. or its subsidiaries, excluding borrowers with residential mortgage loans purchased on the secondary market and residential mortgage loans insured with lender-paid mortgage insurance.</p>		<p>Terence S. Ziegler Donna Siegel Moffa Amanda R. Trask Michelle A. Coccagna KESSLER TOPAZ MELTZER & CHECK, LLP 280 King of Prussia, Rd. Radnor, PA 19087</p>
6-14-2012	10-CV-00132	(D. Nev.)	<p>Szymborski v. Ormat Technologies, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Ormat's stock price was artificially inflated and Defendants used false or materially misleading financial statements for Ormat's geothermal energy resource project at North Brawley.</p> <p>Class Members are persons who purchased or otherwise acquired Ormat Technologies, Inc. Securities between 5-7-2008 and 2-24-2010, inclusive, and incurred damages.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, e-mail or call:</p> <p>Lionel Z. Glancy Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP 1925 Century Park East Suite 2100 Los Angeles, Cal. 90067 settlements@glancylaw.com 1-888-773-9224</p>
6-15-2012	MDL-2047	(E.D. La.)	<p>In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Products Liability Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Chinese Drywall caused</p>	11-13-2012	For more information visit:

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>property damage and personal injuries. The companies being sued are homebuilders, developers, installers, realtors, brokers, suppliers, importers, exporters and distributors that were involved with Chinese Drywall, and their insurers.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities, along with their heirs, representatives, attorneys, executors, administrators, executives, subsequent purchasers, residents, guests, tenants, lenders, successors and assigns, with claims, known or unknown, arising from or related to actual or alleged Chinese Drywall purchased, imported, supplied, distributed, marketed, installed, used, sold or in any way alleged to be within the legal responsibility of any Participating Defendant. A Participating Defendant shall also be a Class Member to the extent the Participating Defendant has remediated the Chinese Drywall in one or more Affected Properties or repurchased an Affected Property. Participating Insurers are not Class Members. Class Members do not include persons or entities with claims involving an Affected Property in the Commonwealth of Virginia.</p>		http://www.laed.uscourts.gov/drywall/Settlements.htm
6-18-2012	10-CV-11912	(D. Mass.)	<p>D. Michael Collins and Milford & Ford Associates, Inc. v. ACS, Inc. f/ka American Consumer Shows, Inc., and American Consumer Shows, LLC</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ("TCPA") and certain regulations promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") by sending unsolicited facsimile advertisements</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Edward A. Broderick Anthony I. Paronich Broderick Law, P.C. 125 Summer Street Suite 1030 Boston, MA 02110</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>offering their goods or services, and facsimile advertisements which did not contain legally-required "opt-out" notices informing the recipient how to request not to receive any more faxes.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities within the United States to whom American Consumer Shows, Inc. sent or caused to be sent facsimile advertisements promoting American Consumer Shows, Inc. trade and/or consumer shows from 9-30-2005 to the present date. Such facsimiles were unsolicited and/or did not contain "opt-out" notices as required by the TCPA and applicable FCC regulations.</p>		<p>Matthew P. McCue The Law Office of Matthew P. McCue 1 South Ave, Third Floor Natick, MA 01760</p>
6-18-2012	10-CV-239	(M.D. Ga.)	<p>Keithly v. Intelius, Inc. and Hook v. Intelius Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Intelius deceived customers into signing up for an identity protection program and forwarded Plaintiffs' credit card information to other vendors without Plaintiffs' permission.</p> <p>Class Members are all Persons residing in the United States who subscribed to Identity Protect from the first day the product was offered until the [date of preliminary approval of settlement], except for consumers who were not charged, (e.g. who cancelled the subscription before seven days) or have received a full refund of any Identity Protect charges.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call: (206) 623-1700</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
6-20-2012	10-CV-01025	(D. Ariz.)	<p>(UPDATED) Facciola v. Greenberg Traurig, LLP Plaintiffs allege violation of the Arizona Securities Act.</p> <p>Class Members are of the following two settlement classes (the "Settlement Classes"):</p> <p>("the ML Settlement Class") All persons who, during the period from 9-1-2005 through 6-3-2008, (a) invested or held investments in Mortgages Ltd. (or the limited liability companies it managed); (b) purchased, acquired, or held interest in deeds of trust issued to Mortgages Ltd.; or (c) purchased or held investments, securities, or beneficial interests in securities from or issued by Mortgages Ltd. (or the limited liability companies it managed) or Mortgages Ltd. Securities.</p> <p>("the RB Settlement Class") All persons who, during the period from 9-1-2005 through 6-3-2008, (a) invested or held investments in Radical Bunny; (b) purchased (or held) through Radical Bunny interest in loans by Radical Bunny to Mortgages Ltd.; (c) purchased (or held) through Radical Bunny interests in deeds of trust issued to Mortgages Ltd.; or (d) purchased or held investments, securities, or beneficial interest in securities from or issued by Radical Bunny.</p>	9-14-12	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Mortgages Ltd Radical Bunny Securities Litigation c/o Rust Consulting, Inc. Faribault, MN 55021-9763</p>
6-20-2012	10-CV-7266	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Stephanie Wolff v. Hyatt Corporations, et al. Plaintiffs allege claims against Defendants for: 1) violation of the Americans with Disabilities</p>	10-1-2012	<p>For more information write to:</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.; 2) violation of California's Unruh Civil Rights Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 51 et seq.; and 3) violation of California's Disabled Persons Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 54 et seq. These claims are based on allegations of inadequate disability exterior access and related signage at the Hyatt Regency Century Plaza hotel (the "Hotel") and the parking garage located behind the hotel, (the "Parking Lot"), located at 2025 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, California 90067, and 2030 Century Park West, Los Angeles, California 90067, respectively. Plaintiff further alleges against defendant Hyatt Corporation additional claims for: 1) violation of California's Unfair Competition Law; and 2) California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act. These claims are based on allegations that defendant Hyatt Corporation falsely advertised ADA-compliance.</p> <p>Class Members are all mobility impaired individuals with a disability who, between 9-29-2006 and 6-1-2011 (the "Class Period"), were denied full and equal access and/or enjoyment of Hyatt's accommodations as a result of Defendants' alleged failure to provide adequate exterior disability access and/or related signage, and who, according to defendant Hyatt Corporation's records, requested an accessible room for a stay during the Class Period and/or who complained in writing that premises were not fully accessible.</p>		<p>Jason M. Wucetich Wucetich & Korovilas LLP. 222 North Sepulveda Blvd. Suite 2000 El Segundo, CA 90245</p>
6-21-2012	08-MD-1963	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: The Bear Stearns Companies, Inc. Securities, Derivative, and ERISA Litigation Plaintiffs allege that the Bear Stearns</p>	Not set yet	For more information write to, call or visit:

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Defendants violated the federal securities laws. Between 3-17-2008 and 7-23-2008, additional securities class action complaints were filed and subsequently consolidated into this Action by order dated 1-6-2009.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who, during the period from 12-14-2006 to and through 3-14-2008, inclusive, purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly traded common stock or other equity securities, or call options of or guaranteed by Bear Stearns, or sold Bear Stearns put options, either in the open market or pursuant to a traceable registration statement, and were damaged thereby. The Settlement Class also includes all persons who received Bear Stearns Capital Accumulation Plan ("CAP") Units and Restricted Stock Units that had fully vested, entitling them to an equivalent number of shares of Bear Stearns common stock upon settlement at the end of a deferral period during the Class Period, as part of their compensation as an employee with Bear Stearns and participation in its CAP and Restricted Stock Unit Plan.</p>		<p>LABATON SUCHAROW LLP Thomas A. Dubbs James W. Johnson 140 Broadway New York, NY 10005 Tel: (888) 219-6877 www.labaton.com settlementquestions@labaton.com</p>
6-21-2012	08-CV-05701	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Marolda v. Symantec Corp. Plaintiffs allege that when customers had previously enrolled in Norton's automatic renewal program and then subsequently upgraded their Norton software, Symantec improperly charged them for both the upgrade and the earlier subscription.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit, call or e-mail: www.NortonSettlement.com 1-877-853-3045 info@NortonSettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Class Members are all individuals, businesses and other entities in the United States who between 10-1-2005 and 5-23-2012: (a) purchased an Eligible Product; (b) enrolled in Norton's automatic renewal service for that product; (c) purchased (or renewed) a second Eligible Product either during the term of a subscription to the first Eligible Product or within 60 days after being charged an automatic renewal charge for that first Eligible Product; (d) installed the second Eligible Product on the same computer as the first Eligible Product, and (e) have not received a refund of the automatic renewal charge.</p>		
6-21-2012	11-CV-01726	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Fraley v. Facebook, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Facebook unlawfully used Settlement Class Members' names, profile pictures, photographs, likenesses, and identities to advertise or sell products and services through Sponsored Stories, without obtaining Settlement Class Members' consent.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons in the United States who have or have had a Facebook account at any time and had their names, nicknames, pseudonyms, profile pictures, photographs, likenesses, or identities displayed in a Sponsored Story at any time on or before the date of entry of the Preliminary Approval Order.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call: Robert S. Arns of Arns Law Firm (800) 495-7800</p>
6-22-2012	09-CV-02094	(S.D. Cal.)	<p>EasySaver Rewards Litigation Plaintiffs allege that they and other persons</p>	Not set yet	For more information write to:

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>were enrolled in one or more of the Membership Programs and charged membership fees without their knowledge or consent after placing an order for merchandise with a Provided Commerce Website and did not receive an appropriate confirmation of their enrollment. The Named Plaintiffs have asserted various legal claims, including claims for breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, fraud, unjust enrichment, invasion of privacy-intrusion into private matters, negligence, and for alleged violations of California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act, California's Unfair Competition Law and the federal Electronic Funds Transfer Act.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who, between 8-19-2005 and [date of preliminary approval order], placed an order with a website operated by Provide Commerce, Inc. and were subsequently enrolled by Regent Group Inc. dba Encore Marketing International, Inc. in one or more of the following membership programs: EasySaver Rewards, RedEnvelope Rewards, or Preferred Buyers Pass (the "Membership Programs").</p>		<p>James R. Patterson Patterson Law Group, APC 402 West Broadway, 29th Floor San Diego, Cal. 92101</p> <p>Michael D. Singer Cohelan Khoury & Singer 605 C Street, Suite 200 San Diego, Cal. 92101</p> <p>Bruce W. Steckler Baron & Budd PC 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue Suite 1100 Dallas, Texas 75219</p> <p>Jennie Lee Anderson Andrus Anderson LLP 155 Montgomery Street Suite 900 San Francisco, Cal. 94104</p>
6-22-2012	09-CV-02145	(W.D. Tenn.)	<p>Ham v. Swift Transportation Company, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that they were students who attended the Academy and received testing for portions of their examination for a Tennessee commercial driver license ("CDL") from Swift employees who were third party CDL Examiners for the State of Tennessee. Plaintiffs contend that the Tennessee Department of Safety ("TDOS")</p>		<p>For more information call or visit: 1-866-430-8108 www.cdlsettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>determined that their CDL testing by the third party CDL Examiners or the CDL testing of many of the students at the Academy was not done in accordance with Tennessee and federal regulations. As a result Tennessee and other States to which drivers transferred their CDLs required Plaintiffs and Class members to re-test in support of their CDL's. Plaintiffs further claim that Swift is liable to them for amounts that they paid for the original CDL testing and/or for amounts that they incurred in order to re-test in support of their CDLs.</p> <p>Class Members are all former students of the Swift Driving Academy in Millington, Tennessee (the "Academy") who, from 5-2005 through 2-2008, received a Tennessee CDL while enrolled at Swift and who subsequently were sent notice from the Tennessee Department of Safety or another state motor vehicle bureau that they needed to be re-tested in order to maintain their CDL because the original CDL testing they received through Swift was improper.</p>		
6-22-2012	09-CV-792	(M.D. Ala.)	<p>In re: Colonial BancGroup, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants were fiduciaries of the Plan and violated fiduciary duties under ERISA that they owed to Plan participants and beneficiaries. In the Complaint, Plaintiffs have asserted causes of action for the losses suffered by the Plan as a result of the alleged breaches of fiduciary duty by Defendants. Portions of the accounts of participants in the Plan were invested in Colonial Stock. The Action</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to: Whatley Drake & Kallas, LLC Joe R. Whatley Jr. P.O. Box 10647 Birmingham, AL 35202-0647</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>alleges that the Plan's fiduciaries, including certain former officers and directors of Colonial BancGroup, Inc., failed to act appropriately when the Plan's holdings of Colonial Stock allegedly became an imprudent investment.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who were participants in or beneficiaries of the Colonial BancGroup 401(k) Plan at any time between 4-18-2007 and 8-25-2009 and whose accounts included investments in Colonial Stock.</p>		
6-25-2012	05-CV-01908	(S.D. Ind.)	<p>Ormond, et al. v. Anthem, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Anthem breached its fiduciary duties and was negligent by setting the IPO price too low, thus under-compensating the Class members by paying them too little cash in exchange for their mutual membership interests in Anthem Insurance.</p> <p>Class Members are all former members of Anthem Insurance residing in Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky and Connecticut who received cash compensation in connection with the demutualization of Anthem Insurance on 11-2-2001 (with certain exclusions detailed in the notice of class action settlement).</p>		<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Eric H. Zagrans ZAGRANS LAW FIRM LLC 24500 Chagrin Boulevard Suite 200 Cleveland, OH 44122</p> <p>Dennis P. Barron 582 Torrence Lane P.O. Box 8190 Cincinnati, OH 45208</p>
6-25-2012	07-MD-1840	(D. Kan.)	<p>In re: Motor Fuel Temperature Sales Practices Litigation Plaintiffs allege that the Companies violated state consumer protection and other laws by selling motor fuel to retail consumers for a</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Notice Administrator Hot Fuel Settlement c/o Dahl</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>specified price per gallon without disclosing or adjusting for the effects of temperature.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who bought gasoline or diesel fuel at a gas station in any of the States at Issue between 1-1-2001, and [preliminary hearing date]. For some of the Settlements, Class members must have purchased motor fuel from a station owned, operated or branded by one of the Defendants' Companies.</p>		<p>Administration PO Box 3614, Minneapolis, MN 55403-0614</p>
6-26-2012	08-CV-2516	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: Municipal Derivatives Antitrust Litigation Supplemental Notice from J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., J.P. Morgan Securities, Inc., and Bear Stearns & Co, Inc., (collectively, the "Settling Defendants) regarding proposed settlement includes documents not yet filed as of Settling Defendants' original notice (see 6-7-2012).</p>	12-14-2012	<p>For more information visit or call: www.MunicipalDerivativesSettlement.com 1-877-310-0512</p>
6-27-2012	08-CV-2317	(M.D. Pa.)	<p>Shirley Craig v. Rite Aid Corporation et al. Plaintiffs allege that they should have been classified as non-exempt employees and that they were entitled to overtime compensation.</p> <p>Class Members consist of (1) the Settlement Class Representatives, and all individuals who as of the date of the Settlement Agreement have filed consents to join the Wage-Hour Lawsuits, who worked at Rite Aid as salaried Assistant Store Managers or Co-Managers during the three year period prior to the earlier of their becoming a Plaintiff in their respective actions or opting into any of the Wage-Hour Lawsuits; and (2) all</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			other salaried Assistant Store Managers or Co-Managers employed by Rite Aid.		
6-28-2012	10-CV-05260	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Rojas v. Career Education Corporation Plaintiffs allege unsolicited text messages advertising "creative" jobs requiring "imagination" were sent from Defendant Career Education Corporation ("CEC"). The Plaintiffs say this is a violation of the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who received an unsolicited text message advertising CEC's Academy schools on 8-27-2008.</p>	10-23-2012	<p>For more information call:</p> <p>(206) 876-5206</p>
6-28-2012	11-CV-2794	(S.D. Cal.)	<p>Foos v. Ann, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Ann Inc. violated California Civil Code section 1747.8 by requesting and recording Personal Identification Information, including, but not limited to, zip codes, of California Ann Inc. store customers who paid for merchandise using a credit card, and seeks civil penalties and attorneys' fees.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who, between 9-30-2010 and [date of entry of Preliminary Approval Order], used a credit card to make a purchase at a California Ann Inc. Store and whose Personal Identification Information, including, but not limited to zip code, was requested and recorded by Ann Inc. during the credit card transaction.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Joseph J. Siprut Siprut P.C. 122 South Michigan Avenue Suite 1850 Chicago, IL 60603</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
6-28-2012	06-CV-4481	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Dr. Leonard E. Saltzman, Brad Zurn, Tim Bastiaanse, Joseph Palmiotto, and Judith McClosky v. Pella Corporation, an Iowa corporation, and Pella Windows and Doors, Inc., a Delaware corporation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Pella ProLine Casement Windows manufactured by Pella Corporation contain defects that have caused water intrusion and resulting damage to the windows and Plaintiffs' property; that some Pella ProLine Casement Window owners have paid for repairs or replacements of their subject windows; and that some owners will require future repairs or replacements of their Pella windows.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons in the United States who are current or former owners of structures containing Pella ProLine brand casement, awning and/or transom windows (including 250 and 450 Series) manufactured by Pella Corporation between 1991 and 2006.</p>	Not set yet	No information
6-29-2012	08-CV-0037	(W.D. Okla.)	<p>Hill et al. v. Marathon Oil Company</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Marathon breached the lease contracts, including the implied duty to market the gas, and breached a fiduciary duty allegedly owed to its royalty interest owners. The Plaintiffs further claim that Marathon has not reported royalty payments correctly, in violation of the Oklahoma Production Revenue Standards Act (PRSA), and has misrepresented certain information related to its royalty payments.</p>	9-27-2012	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail:</p> <p>Jami R. Antonisse Dubuin, Larimore and Bialick 920 N. Harvey Okalahoma City, OK 73102</p> <p>(405) 235-7779</p> <p>Mark.christiansen@crowedu</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in June, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Class Members are all persons who own or owned minerals in the State of Oklahoma subject to an oil gas lease from 1-1-2002 to the present, wherein (1) they received royalty payments on the sale and disposition of gas attributable to Marathon's interest in Oklahoma properties; and (2) their royalty payments were reduced as a result of the reduction of production volumes and/or production proceeds [expended] for marketing, gathering, compressing, dehydrating, treating, processing or transporting of hydrocarbons produced from the unit.</p>		<p>nlevy.com</p>
6-29-2012	09-CV-4143	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>David Himer v. Automobile Club of New York, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Automobile Club of New York, Inc. ("AAANY") violated a requirement imposed by the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act ("FACTA"). Specifically, Plaintiff claims that AAANY printed the expiration dates of the credit card on receipts presented to customers at the point of sale in its branch offices in New York, in violation of FACTA.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who received electronically printed receipts from any Automobile Club of New York, Inc. branch at the point of sale or in a transaction occurring between 6-4-2008 and 9-28-2009.</p>	9-6-2012	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Edelman, Combs, Lattuner & Goodwin, LLC 120 South LaSalle Street 18th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60603</p>